

In the Drawings:

Please replace all 15 sheets of the original drawings with the enclosed 15 Replacement Sheets of formal drawings with Figs. 1 to 25 thereon. The Replacement Sheets have improved clarity and formality compared to the original sheets, without substantive changes.

**[RESPONSE CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE]**

REMARKS:

- 1) The Examiner's attention is directed to the enclosed Information Disclosure Statement. Please consider the references, and return an initialed, signed and dated acknowledgment copy of the IDS Form PTO-1449 of June 6, 2007.
- 2) The Examiner's attention is directed to the enclosed Drawing Transmittal accompanied by 15 Replacement Sheets, which have improved clarity and formality without substantive changes compared to the original sheets. These 15 Replacement Sheets correspond to the formal drawings filed on July 20, 2004, but they are being resubmitted, because entry and acceptance thereof have not yet been acknowledged. See item 10) of the Office Action Summary. Thus, please enter the enclosed 15 Replacement Sheets, and indicate the acceptance of these drawings in the next official communication.
- 3) Section 1 on page 2 of the Office Action indicates that the Substitute Specification filed on July 20, 2004 *"has not been entered and is a mere duplicate of the specification filed April 14, 2004"*. This assertion is respectfully traversed, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the Substitute Specification. The Notice to File Missing Parts dated June 28, 2004 expressly required a Substitute Specification because pages 4 to 6 and 11 of the original specification were unacceptable due to insufficient clarity or legibility. The original specification filed on April 14, 2004 was a telefax copy, which

had a vertical line across pages 4 to 6 and 11 as a defect of the telefax transmission. Thus, as explained in the submission of July 20, 2004, the Substitute Specification is a clear, legible non-telefax "original print" or "hard copy" replacement of the telefax copy that had originally been filed on April 14, 2004. Thus, because it is not a telefax copy, the Substitute Specification filed on July 20, 2004 has improved clarity, contrast, and legibility, in compliance with the requirement set forth in the Notice to File Missing Parts. Accordingly, please enter the Substitute Specification, as it was specifically required in the Notice to File Missing Parts.

- 4) The original specification was essentially a literal translation of a corresponding foreign application text. The specification has now been amended in an editorial and formal manner to better comply with US requirements, for example regarding typical US application format including section headings and avoiding reference to specific claim numbers in the written description. Also, a few typographical, grammatical, and translation errors have been corrected. The corrections are supported by the substance and context of the original disclosure, without introducing any new matter. The form and content of the abstract has also been revised to better comply with US requirements. Entry of the amendments in the written description and the abstract are respectfully requested.
- 5) The original claims were essentially a literal translation of corresponding foreign language claims. The claims have now been

amended in an editorial manner to avoid the "literal" nature of a literal translation, and to achieve better consistency and streamlining of the claim terminology. Also, the claims have been substantively amended as follows. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of prior claim 13. Claim 8 has been amended into independent form, incorporating subject matter from prior claims 1 + 3 + 5 + 8. Claim 9 has been amended into independent form, incorporating subject matter from prior claims 1 + 2 + 9. Claim 12 has been amended into independent form, incorporating subject matter from prior claims 1 + 12. Claim 13 has been canceled. Since these claim amendments are merely editorial and/or merely involve claim combinations, no new matter has been introduced. Entry and consideration of the claim amendments are respectfully requested.

- 6) After the present claim amendments, claims 1 to 12 read on the elected Species I relating to Figs. 2 to 5. Claims 9 and 12 are generic. The non-elected claims 14 to 22 remain withdrawn, but are dependent from generic claim 12. Thus, if generic claim 12 is ultimately found allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rejoin, consider and allow the non-elected withdrawn claims 14 to 22.
- 7) Referring to section 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 1 to 12 as indefinite under 35 USC 112(2) has been taken into account in the present amendment. The unclear terms noted by the Examiner in original claims 1 and 2 have been

avoided in amended claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, please withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112(2).

- 8) Referring to section 7 on page 4 of the Office Action, the indication of allowable subject matter in prior claim 13 is appreciated. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of prior claim 13. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 to 7 should now be allowable.
- 9) It is further noted that claims 8 to 12 had not been rejected on prior art grounds. Thus, prior claims 8 to 12 must be recognized as being substantively allowable. Claims 8, 9 and 12 have now each been amended into independent form. Thus, claims 8, 9 and 12, as well as claims 10 and 11 depending from claim 9 and claims 14 to 22 depending from claim 12, should now be allowable.
- 10) Referring to section 6 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the rejection of claims 1 to 7 as anticipated by French reference 2 416 825 (Sorlin) has been obviated by the present amendment. Each one of the remaining independent claims 1, 8, 9 and 12 now incorporates subject matter from prior non-rejected claims (13, 8, 9 and 12 respectively). Thus, the rejection does not apply against any of the present amended claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.
- 11) The additional prior art made of record requires no particular comments, because it has not been applied against the claims.

- 12) Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, including all present claims 1 to 12 and 14 to 22, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alois Johann HARINGER  
Applicant

WFF:ks/4677  
Enclosures:  
postcard,  
Form PTO-2038,  
Term Extension Request,  
Drawing Transmittal,  
15 Replacement Sheets,  
Transmittal Cover Sheet,  
IDS, Form PTO-1449,  
2 references, 1 abstract

BY Walter F. Fasse  
Walter F. Fasse  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No.: 36132  
Tel. 207-862-4671  
Fax. 207-862-4681  
P.O. Box 726  
Hampden, ME 04444-0726

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all indicated enclosures is being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail, in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Walter F. Fasse 6/6/07  
Name: Walter F. Fasse - Date: June 6, 2007